

teach the features of the parent claims, the reference fails to teach or suggest the features of the dependent claims. Note that no prior art has been applied against Claim 8, the subject matter of which has been incorporated into Claim 1, with Claim 9 being similarly amended. The Examiner recognizes that this reference fails to teach the features of Claims 2-6, 10-12, 15 and 20, but contends that these claimed features would be obvious. If the features are obvious as being known in the prior art, then the Examiner is requested to cite specific prior art to teach these features.

It is noted that Claims 7, 8, 13, and 14 were referenced in the body of this rejection but not included in the statement of rejection. Thus these claims are deemed to be excluded from the rejection.

In view of the amendments to the claims, it is submitted that Narayan et al. fail to teach or suggest, either expressly or impliedly, the features recited in Claims 2-6, 10-12, 15 and 20, and thus this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing comments, each objection and rejection is deemed overcome. Thus this application is believed to be in condition for allowance based on Claims 1-7 and 9-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 1998

✓ 

L. E. Carnahan
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 20,555
Tel. No. (925) 422-5024